REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been cancelled. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the cancelled claims in a continuation application. Claims 13-18 are newly submitted. The specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 13-18 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I.   Specification

The Examiner asserts that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to be indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

II.   The § 101 Rejections

Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner noted that claims 7-12 recited a computer readable medium that was not tangibly embodied in a storage medium in a manner so as to be executable by a computer or processor. Claims 7-12 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims. However, newly submitted claims 16-18 recite computer readable medium claims that are encoded with a computer program that comprises computer executable code. Applicant respectfully submits that the computer readable medium claims recited in claims 16-18 recite statutory subject matter as set forth in MPEP § 2106.

III.   The § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,313,638 to Ogle et al. ("Ogle").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 13 recites a method for processing ingress messages for a state based application being executed by network processor, in which the state based application has a first state and a second state. In particular, the method includes associating the first state of the state based application to a first set of message classes that are receivable by the state based application while the state based application is in the first state, and associating the second state of the state based application to a second set of message classes that are receivable by the state based application while the state based application is in the second state, the second set of message classes being distinct from the first set of message classes. The method further includes assigning the first set of message classes to a first semaphore, and assigning the second set of message classes to a second semaphore

A. *Ogle Fails to Disclose Assigning a First Set of Message Classes to a First Semaphore and Assigning a Second Set of Message Classes to a Second Semaphore in which the First Set of Message Classes is Distinct from the Second Set of Message Classes as required in Claim 13*

Ogle discloses a method for inter-process communication in which a plurality of memory segments and a queue are shared by processes (see Abstract). A semaphore is associated with each memory segment, and (in addition) a message semaphore, queue semaphore, and wakeup semaphore are provided to ensure that one thread of a given process has access to selected portions of the inter-process communication at a time (col. 1, ll. 47-52).

Although Ogle discloses a method for inter-process communication that includes the use of semaphores, Ogle however, fails to disclose <u>assigning a first set of message classes to a first semaphore</u>, and <u>assigning a second set of message classes to a second semaphore</u>, in which the

first set of message classes is distinct from the second set of message classes, as required by claim 13. Instead, Ogle discloses use of only a single semaphore – i.e., a message semaphore – that handles <u>all messages</u> passed between user programs 20, a file system driver 21, and a cache manager 22 (col. 2, ll. 50-64; FIG. 2).

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over Ogle.

B. *Other Independent Claims*

Claim 16 incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 12. Claim 16, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also allowable over Ogle for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 13.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-18 are allowable over Ogle, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

May 10, 2007

/Kelvin M. Vivian/
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448